

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 287347

10

ORIGIN EUR-04

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /005 R

66611

DRAFTED BY: EUR/RPM:GBHELMAN/DB

APPROVED BY: EUR/RPM:GBHELMAN

----- 126289

R 122130Z SEP 74

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY PARIS

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 187347

FOLLOWING REPEAT STATE 187347 ACTION NATO 26 AUGUST.

QUOTE

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 187347

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MCAP, NATO

SUBJECT: NATO DEFENSE PLANNING

REF: A. STATE 179599; B. USNATO 4527

1. TEXT BELOW IS FINAL SECTION OF A DRAFT PAPER ON NATO DEFENSE PLANNING CURRENTLY BEING REVIEWED HERE FOR SUBMISSION TO NATO AS A BASIS FOR MINISTERIAL DISCUSSION IN DECEMBER OF THE KEY ELEMENTS OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE. PREVIOUS SECTIONS OF DRAFT PAPER WERE FORWARDED INFORMALLY TO USNATO BY BERGOLD-MCAULIFFE LETTER OF 21 AUGUST. REQUEST MISSION COMMENT ON PAPER AS A WHOLE.

2. BEGIN TEXT:

IV PLANNING GUIDANCE

1. TO CARRY OUT THE OBJECTIVES OUTLINED ABOVE, NATO'S DEFENSE PLANNING SYSTEMS WILL HAVE TO BE REVAMPED.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 287347

ABOVE ALL, THERE IS A NEED FOR GREATER INVOLVEMENT OF

NATIONAL AUTHORITIES AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES AT THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL, AT ALL STAGES, SO AS TO ENSURE COORDINATION OF PROGRAMS, COOPERATIVE PLANNING, AND DEVELOPMENT OF COMMON PLANS AND PROGRAMS.

2. NATO'S MAJOR INTERESTS IN DEFENSE PLANNING LIE IN THE AREAS OF:

A. OPERATIONAL PLANNING, FOR THE MOST EFFECTIVE USE OF AVAILABLE FORCES AND FACILITIES AGAINST A RANGE OF CONTINGENCIES. THIS REQUIRES IMPROVED COORDINATION OF NATIONAL EFFORTS AND GREATER FLEXIBILITY IN PLANNING FOR THE USE OF NATIONAL FORCES IN COOPERATION WITH NMA'S.

B. PROGRAM PLANNING, FOR THE ORDERLY MAINTENANCE OF NATIONAL FORCES AND NATO PROGRAMS WITHIN FORESEEABLE RESOURCES.

C. WEAPONS AND EQUIPMENT PLANNING, TO INCLUDE (A) COOPERATION IN IMPLEMENTATION OF WEAPONS AND EQUIPMENT ASPECTS OF "BASIC ISSUES" IMPROVEMENTS; (B) REVIEW OF PLANNING FOR REPLACEMENT OF MAJOR OBSOLESCEMENT OR WORN-OUT WEAPONS AND EQUIPMENT AND (C) TIMELY REVIEW OF THE IMPLICATIONS OF MAJOR NEW OR POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THE WEAPONS AND EQUIPMENT FIELD.

3. OPERATIONAL PLANNING.

A. THIS IS DIRECTED AT MAKING THE BEST USE OF ALL AVAILABLE FORCES AND FACILITIES, AS WELL AS FLEXIBILITY IN THEIR USE. IT TAKES AS A STARTING POINT (1) THE CURRENT NATIONAL FORCES EXPECTED TO BE AVAILABLE IN NATO DEFENSE, (2) THE EXISTING NATO COMMAND STRUCTURE (HEADQUARTERS, COMMAND AND CONTROL, AND DOCTRINE) AND (3) THE EXISTING NATO INFRASTRUCTURE AND PROGRAMS IN SUPPORT OF THE FORCES. FROM THESE SHOULD EVOLVE THE BEST POSSIBLE OPERATIONAL CAPABILITIES RESPONDING TO A RANGE OF SCENARIOS WITH PROVISION FOR FLEXIBILITY TO MEET CONTINGENCY REQUIREMENTS.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 287347

B. ADEQUATE OPERATIONAL PLANNING REQUIRES THE PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF A FAMILY OF PLANS COVERING NOT ONLY MILITARY OPERATIONS IN TIMES OF HOSTILITIES BUT ALSO COVERING CONTINGENCY PLANS FOR MOBILIZATION (OR PARTIAL MOBILIZATION) AND REINFORCEMENT OF DEPLOYED FORCES IN TIMES OF INCREASING TENSION, AS WELL AS OPTIONS FOR BEST USE OF WARNING TIME TO ENHANCE

DEFENSIVE PREPARATIONS AND FORCE DEPLOYMENTS.

4. PROGRAM PLANNING.

OVERALL PROGRAM PLANNING IN NATO DEALS WITH ANNUAL REVIEW OF NATIONAL FORCE PROGRAMS AND OF NATO SUPPORTING

PROGRAMS AND MODIFICATION OF OBJECTIVES IN EITHER CASE AS REQUIRED TO PERMIT CONTINUATION OF EFFECTIVE NATO DEFENSE WITHIN FORESEEABLE RESOURCES. BASIC CRITERIA FOR THESE REVIEWS INCLUDE MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE, BASIC ISSUES FORCE IMPROVEMENT DECISIONS, AND OTHER DECISIONS OF THE DEFENSE PLANNING COMMITTEE, WHETHER IN MINISTERIAL OR PERMANENT SESSION.

5. WEAPONS AND EQUIPMENT PLANNING

THIS FIELD COVERS (A) COOPERATION IN NATIONAL OR NATO IMPLEMENTATION OF BASIC ISSUES FORCE IMPROVEMENTS AS THEY INVOLVE MAJOR WEAPONS OR EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS; (B) REVIEW OF NATIONAL OR NATO PLANS FOR TIMELY REPLACEMENT OF MAJOR WEAPONS EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS; AND (C) REVIEW OF THE IMPLICATIONS FOR NATO DEFENSE OF PENDING MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS IN THE WEAPONS OR EQUIPMENT FIELD.

6. SPECIFIC PLANNING TASKS FOR THE NATO MILITARY AUTHORITIES

A. IN LIEU OF THE NORMAL FORCE PROPOSALS DEALING WITH DESIGN OF NATIONAL FORCES FOR 1977-1982, NMA'S SHOULD SUBMIT BY 1 FEBRUARY 1976 PROPOSALS BY REGION (INCLUDING SEPARATE COVERAGE FOR MARITIME) DESIGNED TO PERMIT MORE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION IN NATO DEFENSE OF PLANNED

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 287347

NATIONAL FORCES FOR THE PERIOD AS ACCEPTED BY MINISTERS IN THEIR DECEMBER 1974 ACTION ON NATIONAL FORCE PLANS FOR 1975-1979. THE REGIONAL PROPOSALS WILL IDENTIFY PRACTICAL STEPS WHICH CAN BE TAKEN BY NATIONS OR IN NATO PROGRAMS, WITHIN ANTICIPATED RESOURCE LEVELS, TO PERMIT PLANNED FORCES FOR NATO TO OPERATE EFFECTIVELY TOGETHER IN A MORE COHERENT AND FLEXIBLE NATO DEFENSE. THE PROPOSALS SHOULD EMPHASIZE IMMEDIATE OR SHORT-TERM ACTIONS APPLICABLE TO THE 1977-1978 PERIOD, ALTHOUGH MID- AND LONGER-TERM ACTIONS, INCLUDING STANDARDIZATION, SHOULD ALSO BE INDICATED. ALL THE FORCES OF NATO COUNTRIES WHICH MAY BE REASONABLY CONSIDERED AVAILABLE SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT, WHETHER FORMALLY COMMITTED OR NOT.

B. THE MILITARY COMMITTEE, IN IMPLEMENTATION OF ITS RESPONSIBILITY FOR NATO OPERATIONAL PLANNING, WILL SUBMIT AN ANNUAL REPORT ON STATUS OF OPERATIONAL PLANNING EACH FALL. THE FIRST REPORT WILL BE SUBMITTED IN TIME FOR MINISTERIAL REVIEW IN DECEMBER 1975.

7. SPECIFIC PLANNING TASKS FOR THE DEFENSE PLANNING COMMITTEE IN PERMANENT SESSION

A. CONDUCT THE ANNUAL REVIEWS OF NATIONAL FORCE PLANS AND OF NATO SUPPORTING PROGRAMS, WITH RESULTS MADE AVAILABLE TO MINISTERS.

B. PREPARATION BY LATE FALL 1975 OF A FIRST MAJOR REPORT ON RATIONALIZATION, FOR REVIEW AT THE DECEMBER 1975 MINISTERIAL MEETING. THE REPORT SHOULD IDENTIFY ANY CHANGES FOUND DESIRABLE EITHER IN ALLOCATION OF NATIONAL TASKS OR IN SCOPE AND NATURE OF NATO PROGRAMS, TO PERMIT A MORE EFFECTIVE NATO DEFENSE WITHIN AVAILABLE RESOURCES.

C. TAKING ACCOUNT OF (1) MINISTERIAL VIEWS OF DECEMBER 1975 ON RATIONALIZATION OF NATO DEFENSE TASKS AND PROGRAMS, (2) MINISTERIAL DECISIONS OF DECEMBER 1975 ON FORCE PLANS FOR 1976-1980, AS WELL AS (3) THE NMA'S REGIONAL PROPOSALS FOR GREATER COORDINATION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF NATO DEFENSE AS SUBMITTED ON 1 FEBRUARY

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 287347

1976, ESTABLISHMENT OF NATO DEFENSE OBJECTIVES FOR THE PERIOD 1977-1982, FOR NATIONAL FORCES, FOR NATO PROGRAMS, AND AS APPROPRIATE FOR NATO OPERATIONAL PLANNING.

D. ARRANGEMENTS FOR PREPARATION OF AN ANNUAL REPORT ON WEAPONS AND EQUIPMENT PLANNING, COVERING ASPECTS DESCRIBED ABOVE, FOR MINISTERIAL REVIEW. THE FIRST REPORT, FOR DECEMBER 1975, SHOULD IDENTIFY NATIONAL PLANS AND IN ADDITION SHOULD INDICATE FOR EACH NATION WHAT INCREASED EFFECTIVENESS COULD BE SECURED IF THE TOTAL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES FOR THE FIVE YEAR PERIOD WERE INCREASED BY FIVE PERCENT IN REAL TERMS FOR ADDITIONAL PROCUREMENT.

8. PLANNING TASKS FOR COUNTRIES

COUNTRIES SHOULD MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE THEIR FORCES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH PREVIOUS SECTIONS OF THIS GUIDANCE, AND ENGAGE IN THE BROADER DEFENSE PLANNING PROCESSES AS SPECIFIED ABOVE.

3. HUMPHREYS' DRAFT MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE (REF B) PRESENTS

TACTICAL PROBLEM OF HOW TO INJECT US VIEWS ABOVE INTO DRC PAPER TO SUPPORT MINISTERIAL DISCUSSION OF KEY ELEMENTS OF MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE. WHILE WE LEAVE TACTICS TO MISSION'S JUDGMENT, WE ARE INCLINED TO SUPPORT ACCEPTANCE OF HUMPHREYS' INVITATION TO DELEGATION TO CIRCULATE MATERIAL FOR CONSIDERATION IN PARALLEL WITH HIS DRAFT.

4. HUMPHREYS ACKNOWLEDGES IN DRC/WP(74)4 THAT HIS DRAFT IS BASED VERY LARGELY ON THE 1973 DRAFTS. WE FIND THE RESULTING DOCUMENT DEFICIENT IN AT LEAST TWO MAJOR RESPECTS: IT OFFERS NO CONCEPT FOR NATO DEFENSE IN THE LONG TERM, AND IT IS EVEN MORE PESSIMISTIC THAN THE 1973 GUIDANCE IN RESPECT TO THE CONVENTIONAL BALANCE.

5. WE DOUBT THAT MERELY CHANGING THE LANGUAGE OF THE HUMPHREYS' DRAFT CAN CONVERT IT INTO THE TYPE OF DOCUMENT THE US IS SEEKING. UNDOUBTEDLY A DISCUSSION WITH HUMPHREYS WILL BE NEEDED TO COME OUT WITH A MUTUALLY CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 287347

ACCEPTABLE APPROACH.

6. WE ARE CONTINUING WORK ON PAPER REFLECTING US POSITION. WE HOPE TO PROVIDE FOLLOW-ON INSTRUCTIONS TO MISSION BY SEPTEMBER 6. MEANWHILE THERE SHOULD BE NO DISCUSSION OF SPECIFIC DETAILS OF DRAFT PAPER WITH NON-US PERSONNEL EXCEPT AS NECESSARY TO INDICATE TO HUMPHREYS EXTENT OF DIVERGENCE OF OUR PROPOSAL FROM HIS DRAFT.

KISSINGER UNQUOTE KISSINGER

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MILITARY PLANS, TEXTS, COLLECTIVE SECURITY AGREEMENTS, GUIDANCE INSTRUCTIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 12 SEP 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: garlanwa
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974STATE287347
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: EUR/RPM:GBHELMAN/DB
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740256-0163
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740950/aaaabqgb.tel
Line Count: 259
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. STATE 179599; B. USNATO 4527
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: garlanwa
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 25 APR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <25 APR 2002 by rowelle0>; APPROVED <08-Oct-2002 by garlanwa>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: NATO DEFENSE PLANNING
TAGS: MCAP, NATO
To: PARIS
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005